

Remarks

Receipt is acknowledged of the Office Action mailed September 20, 2005. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendment, and the remarks which follow. No new matter is added with the amendments, which are fully supported by the specification.

Claims 1 and 3 have been amended. Claim 4 has been canceled. Claims 1-3 and 5-12 are pending in the application.

Applicants thank the Examiner for acknowledging the claim for foreign priority and for consideration of the IDS filed July 25, 2005. In addition, Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication that Applicants previous submission resulted in the withdrawal of the objections to the drawings, objections to claims 1-4, 6, 8, and 9, as well as the rejections of claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. §112. Finally, Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication that claims 5-12 are allowed and that claims 3 and 4 are only objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim Objections

Claim 3 stands objected to because "as presently written in claim 3, the relationship between the received signal, demultiplexer, and test mode signal can be confusing." In accordance with the Examiner suggestion, Applicants have amended claim 3 to overcome this objection. Accordingly, Applicants request the Examiner to withdraw the objection to claim 3.

Rejections under 35 USC § 102

Claims 1 and 2 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,184,720 to Kim et al. ("Kim"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, "a multiplexer for selectively outputting output signals from the internal voltage generating unit and from a data buffer to a data pad in response to the test mode signal." Thus, Applicants have incorporated all of the limitations of previously presented claim 4 in order to re-write claim 4 in independent form, including all of the limitations of its base claim and intervening claims. In accordance with the Examiner's indication that claim 4 was objected to, but would be allowable if re-written in independent form, Applicants submit that amended independent claim 1 is now in condition for allowance. As such, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claim 1 as being anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) by Kim.

Moreover, Applicant submits that since claim 2 depends directly from amended claim 1 which is now believed to be in condition for allowance, claim 2 is also allowable for the foregoing reasons. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections of claim 2 as being anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) by Kim.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendment and remarks, applicant respectfully requests that all objections and rejections be withdrawn and that a notice of allowance be forthcoming. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney for applicant at 202-912-2160 for any reason related to the advancement of this case.

Date: 12/20/05

Heller Ehrman LLP
1717 Rhode Island Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
Telephone: (202) 912-2000
Facsimile: (202) 912-2020

Respectfully submitted,


Stephen D. Huang
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No.: 45,304

Customer No. 26633